

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final rejection dated December 7, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Buelna, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,605,539) in view of Gentelia, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,267,994). However, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7 and 28 to recite that the electrode is rigidly attached to the distal end of the probe body at a single *point* along the elongated body of the electrode approximately equidistant between the first and second ends. Neither Buelna nor Gentelia teach or suggest this feature. Indeed, the Examiner apparently admits that Gentelia fails to teach or suggest that the electrode is rigidly attached to the distal end of the probe body at a single *point* along the elongated body of the electrode approximately equidistant between the first and second ends. See Office action, page 4 (stating, "[t]he claim does not require that the electrode is attached at a single point). Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7 and 28, and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 2-6 and 8-23, are allowable over Buelna and Gentelia.


The Examiner also rejected claims 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Buelna and Gentelia in view of Haissaguerre, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,068,629). However, each of claims 24-27 depends from one of independent claims 1, 7 and 28, all of which are allowable over Buelna and Gentelia, as discussed above. Haissaguerre fails to remedy the deficiencies of Buelna and Gentelia, as Haissaguerre, either alone or in combination with Buelna and Gentelia, also fails to teach or suggest the electrode is rigidly attached to the distal end of the probe body at a single point along the elongated body of the electrode approximately equidistant between the first and second ends. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7 and 28, and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 24-27, are allowable over Buelna, Gentelia and Haissaguerre.

Claims 1-28 remain pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 28 to place the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant has also amended claim 23 to be consistent with the amendments to base claim 7. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims and drawings, for example, at page 2, line 16 to

Appln No. 10/748,811
Amdt date March 8, 2010
Reply to Office action of December 7, 2010

page 3, line 9; page 5, line 24 to page 6, line 19; Figs. 1 and 3. No new matter is presented. In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of pending claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and a timely indication of allowance. However, if there are any remaining issues that can be addressed by telephone, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's counsel at the number indicated below,

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By  _____
Lauren E. Schneider
Reg. No. 63,712
626/795-9900

LES/les

LES PAS891533.1-*03/8/10 4:29 PM